

LAW OFFICE OF NORA M. TOCUPS

P.O. BOX 698

DECATUR, GEORGIA 30030-0698

404.372.1430

FAX: 404.378.3424

E-MAIL: NTOCUPS@BELLSOUTH.NET

<p>To: Examiner Roland Foster</p> <p>Attn: Corrected Claims after Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment</p>	<p>From: Nora M. Tocups RE: Serial No. 09/513,005 Atty No. 0201-99018</p>
<p>Fax: 703.746.5992</p>	<p>Date: June 17, 2004</p>

Total pages, including cover: 11

In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed on June 9th, 2004, and also in response to telephone messages from and conversations with Examiner Foster, attached is a Revised Amendment and Response and Summary of Telephone Interview with Examiner Foster. The Revised Amendment includes reference to the previously cancelled claims (1-12). The undersigned thanks the Examiner for his courtesies in this matter.

I hereby certify that the correspondence listed below is being transmitted via facsimile transmission to Examiner Foster of the United States Patent and Trademark Office at 703.746.5992 on June 17th, 2004:

- Fax Cover Sheet
- Revised Amendment and Response and Summary of Telephone Interview with Examiner Foster.


 Nora M. Tocups, Reg. 35,717 - On June 17th, 2004

Patents
Serial No. 09/513,005
Response to Office Action mailed 01/28/04

D
#18
RT
6/28/04

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	
)	
BEDINGFIELD, ET AL.)	
)	
Serial No.: 09/513,005)	Art Unit: 2645
)	
Filed February 25th, 2000)	Examiner: Foster
)	
For: Region-Wide Messaging System and Methods Including Validation of Transactions)	Attorney Docket No. 99018
)	
)	

REVISED AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE
AND
SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEW WITH EXAMINER FOSTER

Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, Virginia

Sir:

The Office Action mailed January 28, 2004 was deemed final. As in the previous Office Action, the final Office Action rejected all of the claims (renumbered as claims 13-30) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,812,639 to *Bartholomew et al.*

Patent Examiner Foster is thanked for the telephone interview conducted May 7, 2004. The topics discussed included the differences between the claimed subject matter and *Bartholomew et al.* Specifically, the differences of the claimed voice mail servers that operate in different geographic regions or are operated by different service providers were contrasted with *Bartholomew et al.*'s voice mailboxes that operate in a generally homogenous network. No agreement was reached during the interview.

Concurrently with the filing of this Amendment and Response, a Request for Continuing Examination (RCE) of this application is filed.